

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 are currently pending and under examination. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections made in the final Office Action.¹ In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,185,860 to Wu ("Wu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,499 to Ford et al. ("Ford") and U.S. Patent No. 6,747,961 to Ahmed ("Ahmed").

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, Ford and Ahmed. In particular, Wu, Ford, and Ahmed, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least

. . . under a condition where a prefix corresponding to the interface identification information of the prescribed node stored in another node, not connected to the network, differs from a prefix corresponding to the interface identification information of the prescribed node . . .

a node information providing unit configured to provide the prefix corresponding to the interface identification information compared by the comparing unit to the another node, but without the interface identification information, only when it is judged that the converted interface identification information from the function conversion unit coincides with the converted interface identification information from the another node at the comparing unit

as recited in claim 1 (emphases added).

¹ The final Office Action contains statements characterizing the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statements are specifically identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statements in the final Office Action.

The recited features of claim 1 require at least:

- 1) another node that is not connected to the network knows a different prefix of the prescribed node;
- 2) the another node converts the interface identification information of the prescribed node; and
- 3) the prescribed node provides the different prefix without the interface identification information only when the converted information identification information matches stored converted interface identification information of the prescribed node.

The Examiner concedes that Wu fails to teach or suggest at least the above-listed features of claim 1. (See Office Action at 3-4.) Ford fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu.

Ford describes “a method . . . for automatically generating an IP network address . . . without IP address servers.” (Ford, Abstract.) “An IP address is divided into three portions or regions: a format indication portion, a network identifying portion, and a host identifying portion.” (Ford, column 7, lines 11-13.)

“First, a proposed IP address is generated by selecting a network identifying portion . . . while deterministically generating the host identifying portion based on information available to the IP host. For example, the IEEE 802 Ethernet address found in the network interface card may be used with a deterministic hashing function to generate the host identifying portion of the IP address. Next, the generated IP address is tested on the network to assure that no existing IP host is using that particular IP address. If the generated IP address already exists, then a new IP address is generated.” (Ford, Abstract.)

That is, Ford at most teaches a method for converting interface identification information of a node by using a deterministic hash function, setting the converted

interface identification information as a proposed prefix of the node, comparing the proposed prefix with prefixes of other nodes, setting the proposed prefix as a prefix of the node if the proposed prefix does not coincide with one of the prefixes of other nodes, and further converting the proposed prefix by using the deterministic hash function if the proposed prefix coincides with one of the prefixes of other nodes. Id.

However, Ford fails to even mention providing “the prefix corresponding to the interface identification information . . . without the interface identification information,” as recited in claim 1. In fact, Ford’s teaching of the generated IP address requires the IP address containing “a format indication portion, a network identifying portion, and a host identifying portion,” which is contrary to the recited features in claim 1.

Further, Ford is completely silent regarding any node that is not connected to the network knows a different prefix of the prescribed node, as also required by claim 1.

Ahmed fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu and Ford. Ahmed teaches “mobility management issues within a packet-based multiaccess mobile communications system, which includes a plurality of mobile user stations and a plurality of network nodes, are provided. Location management techniques include tracking and/or locating mobile stations within the system.” (Ahmed, Abstract.) “Note that the HLRs maintain the location of a mobile only through the network node it is currently attached to i.e., the direct network node. Only if the mobile’s point of attachment changes, then the mobile’s HLR needs to be updated. The relative movement among network nodes does not affect the mobiles’ HLRs though it will invoke routing updates. If a mobile moves to another network node, it sends a location update message to its HLR.” (Ahmed, column 13, lines 29-36, emphases added.)

That is, Ahmed's teaching of mobility management using HLR/VLR requires attachment to the mobile network, and thus such teaching cannot suggest any node that is not connected to the network knows a different prefix of the prescribed node, as also required by claim 1.

Further, Ahmed's teaching of location update messages does not constitute "the prefix corresponding to the interface identification information . . . without the interface identification information," as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Wu, Ford, and Ahmed fail to teach or suggest all claim elements of claim 1. Applicants therefore request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1. Dependent claims 2 and 4-6 should also be allowable, at least by virtue of dependence from base claim 1.


Further, independent claims 7 and 13, while of different scope, recite similar features to those of claim 1. Claims 7 and 13, and their respective dependent claims 8 and 10-12 and claims 14 and 16-18 should therefore also be allowable.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 3, 2010

By: 
Beth Z. Shaw
Reg. No. 56,921
(202) 408-4000